IN THE DRAWINGS

Fig. 10 has been amended to show more than one semiconductor light sources. A replacement drawing sheet 6/6 and an annotated sheet thereof showing changes have been provided.

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. Claims 1-6, 10, and 13 have been amended.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

More specifically, the Examiner has stated that the at least one of the individual optical elements being assigned a plurality of semiconductor light sources of claim 7 must be shown or the feature(s) cancelled from the claim(s).

Fig. 10 has been amended to show a plurality of semiconductor light sources.

Claim Objections

Claims 2, 4, and 6 are objected to because of informalities. Appropriate correction has been made. The Examiner is, therefore, requested to withdraw the objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parkyn (US 6,273,596 B1).

The present invention concerns an illumination device, in particular for use in a motor vehicle, comprising:

an array of individual optical elements that are in each case assigned at least one semiconductor light source, in particular a light emitting diode, each optical element including:

a light entry area with a light entry opening having an elongate, essentially rectangular cross section,

a central region perpendicular to the light entry area, a projection of the central region into a two-dimensional plane corresponding to a cylindrical two-dimensional Cartesian oval, and

a parabolic reflector combined with the central region.

Parkyn concerns designing specific lenses according to the desired illumination characteristics of the headlight (column 2, lines 31-34: "class of illumination lenses that can accurately match a source with a particular desired output") and arranging multiple light sources with identical lens in an array (Fig. 10). Each of the light sources alone already provides the desired illumination characteristic of the overall headlight. At least a person with ordinary skill in the art would agree that Parkyn does not disclose that the multiple lenses combined with one another as in Fig. 10 differ from one another in their illumination characteristics.

The demands on the illumination characteristic of a headlight is most of the time very complex (see also column 1, lines 20-25, disadvantage of the prior art). As a result, Parkyn also provides rather complex lenses, which have the imaging characteristics. These will normally never have an essential rectangular cross section in their light entry areas. Therefore, Parkyn only shows complicated lenses which in no way have rectangular light entry areas. In the first paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, the Examiner has referred to Fig. 9a of Parkyn. Fig. 9a shows a cross section through an essentially rotation-symmetric lens (Fig. 9, column 5, line 28). The cross section, in the sense of the present invention, of the light entry area of the lens 900 shown in Figs. 9 and 9a of Parkyn is, therefore, also rotation-symmetric. As can be clearly seen from Figs. 4 and 4a of the instant application, the dimension of the light entry area of the lens according to the present invention is relatively flat.

The advantage of the essential rectangular form of the light entry area of the lens of the present invention (and the resulting flat configuration) lies in that the multiple lenses, when arranged in an array, can be packed very densely and thus can produce a high light output. In

contrast, the very complex lenses of Parkyn must be placed with relative wide space (see Fig. 10), so that no high luminous density as in the present invention can be achieved.

Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over Parkyn and since claims 2-5 are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parkyn in view of Okuchi (US 5,772,306). Claims 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parkyn in view of Jenkins et al. (US 6,099,156).

The dependent claims 6-13 are believed to be patentable based on their dependency on claim 1 which is believed to be patentable as discussed above.

Favorable consideration and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. **Should further issues remain prior to allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the indicated telephone number.**

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 6, 2006

Yonghong Chen
Registration No. 56,150
Customer No. 30448
Akerman Senterfitt
222 Lakeview Avenue, Suite 400
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
Phone: 561-653-5000
Fax: 561-659-6313